

REMARKS

On page 2 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-11, 13, 14, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by King III. Claims 1 and 13-14 have been cancelled. With respect to claim 2, it has been amended to include the amounts in the composition of the hindered amine light stabilizer, the amine oxides, and the hydroxyl amine. Support for this amendment may be found in paragraph 0008. It is noted that these ranges are not disclosed by King III. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 2 and all its dependent claims are now in condition for allowance.

New claim 19 has been added to depend from claim 5 to specifically claim a specific inorganic clarifier. Support for this claim can be found in paragraph 0010 of the equivalent U.S. Patent Application Publication of the present invention (U.S. 2007/0123620).

The Examiner has rejected claims 15 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over King III. The Examiner states that the components of the blend, in weight percent ranges add up to and are the equivalent of what is claimed in claim 15. With the new amendment to claim 2, it is submitted that King III no longer discloses these ranges.

With regard to claim 18, it is noted that King III does teach exposing the polyolefin article to gamma radiation.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over King III further in view of Minami et al. The Examiner notes that King III does not state the type of clarifier used. The Examiner states that Minami in column 21, lines 14-42 teaches inorganic nucleating agents which the Examiner states can also be used as clarifiers. First, there appears to be no basis for the Examiner to conclude that the nucleating agent can also be used as clarifiers. Second, claim 19, which now depends from claim 5, claims a specific inorganic clarifier which Minami does not teach.

On Page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over King III further in view of Scott et al. The Examiner states that King III is silent with respect to the weight percentages of ethylene in the copolymer. The Examiner states that Scott teaches random copolymers of propylene and ethylene within a range called for by claim 12. While Scott et al does call for a polymeric composition, it is noted that the composition does not have any hindered amine light stabilizer, no oxidized amine, nor any hydroxyl amine. Therefore, when the Examiner concludes that Scott is in the same field of endeavor as King III, this is incorrect.

In view of the amendments to the claims, and in light of these remarks, it is submitted that this Application is now in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicant would like to thank Examiner for the attention and consideration accorded the present Application. Should Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place the Application in condition for allowance, Examiner is encouraged to contact undersigned Counsel at the telephone number, facsimile number, address, or email address provided below. It is not believed that any fees for additional claims, extensions of time or the like are required beyond those that may otherwise be indicated in the documents accompanying this paper. However, if such additional fees are required, Examiner is encouraged to notify undersigned Counsel at Examiner's earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 3, 2009

/Gregory N. Clements/
Gregory N. Clements
Registration No.: 30,713
Attorney for Applicant

CLEMENTS | BERNARD
1901 Roxborough Road, Suite 300
Charlotte, North Carolina 28211 USA
Telephone: 704.790.3600
Facsimile: 704.366.9744
glements@worldpatents.com